REVIEW III: Bylaws in Effect 2007-8

- Text in italics represents old bylaw language still in effect for 2007-8
- Text in regular font represents revised bylaws
- Text with a line through does NOT apply in 2007-8
- Comments specific to 2007-8 are in brackets

Section d. Standards for Tenure and Reappointment

General Considerations

Hobart and William Smith Colleges seek to appoint and retain faculty members who will be talented and committed teachers, who will demonstrate quality in their professional work and who will provide valuable service to the Colleges and the community. Therefore, the Colleges’ aim is to assist the growth of individual faculty members by encouraging programs of personal and professional development; by rigorously evaluating their teaching, scholarship, and community service; by providing detailed and constructive feedback on their development as educators, scholars, and members of the community; and by making informed and serious judgments regarding contractual renewal and tenure within a reasonably open process of consultation, discussion, and shared information.

An individual’s qualifications must be judged as a whole and each person's contributions will be greater in some areas than in others. The weighing of a faculty member’s several contributions to the Colleges’ community cannot be accomplished entirely by formula, but certain guidelines should systematically be invoked. Because Hobart and William Smith Colleges are devoted chiefly to undergraduate education, demonstrable excellence in teaching is of paramount importance. Significant scholarly achievement is a second, but still essential, criterion. Meaningful and consistent service to the Colleges and the community is seen as a third measure and is an essential part of the normal and expected duties of faculty members.

Because Hobart and William Smith Colleges are devoted chiefly to undergraduate education, demonstrable high quality in teaching is of paramount importance. Superior professional development is seen as a second criterion. Although a faculty member's teaching and professional development are the primary and secondary measures of evaluation respectively, meaningful and consistent service to the Colleges and the community are seen as an essential part of the normal and expected duties of faculty members.

Teaching

Teaching is a complex task which helps students to gain knowledge, understanding, and skill in academic subjects or disciplines. It enables students to use ideas for themselves in open-minded and analytic ways, empowering them to function fully as individuals and citizens. The evaluation of teaching requires consideration of several qualities reflected in the faculty member's performance: commitment to teaching, effectiveness as a teacher, and mastery of an area of knowledge.

Hobart and William Smith Colleges consider a genuine professional commitment to teaching to be of the highest importance. Enthusiasm for teaching may be as well demonstrated by a quiet and deliberative manner as by more dramatic approaches. It transcends the boundaries of the classroom, finding form in a wide range of activities: personal advising and informal conversations, the encouragement of independent creative or scholarly work, the structure and organization of courses, innovative curriculum development, field work, and the assessment of and response to student performance.
Faculty members should be effective teachers. Though difficult to measure, effectiveness should include an ability to present students with the subject matter in a way which generates intellectual enthusiasm, conveys central insights of the discipline, develops critical habits of thinking, and encourages original scholarly or creative work. An excellent teacher adheres to high intellectual standards, and responds to the work of students with fair and constructive methods of evaluation. Evidence that a faculty member fosters independent thinking and research and serves as a mentor may include, but is not limited to, the supervision of honors projects, independent studies, summer research projects, course equivalents and internships.

Ordinarily, effective teaching cannot be considered wholly apart from professional development. It is related to an individual's mastery of a field of knowledge, to his or her original research or creative work, and to participation in professional organizations. There may, however, be exceptional teachers who do not engage in what is customarily known as scholarly activity. Still, such teachers are expected by the Colleges to be aware of new developments in their field, to renew themselves intellectually, and to reflect this continual development in their teaching.

Faculty members should reflect in their teaching both depth and breadth, including the best and most rigorous work in their disciplines, an attention to the broader outlines of the field, and commitment to the general curriculum. At these Colleges, teaching involves not only one's students but one's colleagues, and requires mutual respect and consideration. Its evaluation takes into account both what the teacher intends, what the teacher does, and what effects such activity has upon students and colleagues.

**Professional Development**

Professional development is reflected in scholarship, in other professional activities, and in general demonstrations of intellectual vitality. Hobart and William Smith Colleges expect that this faculty will achieve high levels of professional development in all its forms. It is important not only in the advancement of human knowledge, but also in the improvement of teaching, as a means of refreshing and revitalizing the Colleges' community, and as an indicator of the Colleges' understanding of their larger social responsibilities.

Scholarship denotes original research in a field or discipline, or its equivalent expression in the creative arts. It seeks to advance the frontiers of knowledge, or to provide new insights into old problems, new interpretations, or continuing questions.

Generally, scholarship takes the form of publication in scholarly journals, monographs or book-length studies, presentations of papers at scholarly conferences, or public performances and exhibition of creative work. Such demonstrations reflect a vital connection to one's peers in the field and make such work available to the criticism and insights of those best able to judge it.

However, the form of scholarly work varies with both the discipline and the reference group for which it is intended. For example, it can include works which interpret one's field to a general rather than a professional audience, unpublished manuscripts, participation in the proceedings of learned societies, lectures to knowledgeable public groups, and participation in colloquia or panel discussions at one's own or other institutions.

The Colleges recognize that professional development occurs both within and between traditional academic disciplines: Wherever such work is offered for evaluation it will be referred to its appropriate reference group for comment. What is of greatest importance in assessing professional development is the strength and quality of the individual's intellectual engagement.
with others and the confidence the institution can gain in its faculty through the various
demonstrations of such engagement.

Community Service

Considerable flexibility is needed in evaluating a faculty member's service to the
Colleges' community because of the great variety of activities which are included in this
category. Many of a faculty member's contributions to the life of the community are intricately
linked to teaching and professional development. Others are part of the normal and expected
duties of the faculty: serving on committees, participating in campus decision making and faculty
governance. Still others include activity outside the Colleges community, work which draws on
and improves the instructor's competence as well as which benefits the Colleges.

Such service cannot be considered as a substitute for achievement in teaching and
professional development, but it does constitute an important contribution to the Colleges.
Moreover, when a faculty member has been asked to carry an abnormal load of such duties, that
circumstance will be considered when evaluating the individual's professional development as
part of an overall review.

A faculty member exists both in relation to students and among colleagues. Members of a
department and of a faculty contribute to the scholarly and intellectual growth of other
colleagues -- reading papers, exchanging views on issues of common concern, discussing
scholarly books and articles, assisting with problems and questions regarding teaching,
developing courses and working in the honors program, etc. Colleagueship may be subtle and
not always easy to evaluate, but it is important in developing and maintaining mutual respect,
openness and intellectual commitment, and represents an essential element of the criterion of
community services.

Section e. Standards, criteria, and procedures for contract renewal, reappointment, tenure, and
promotion

General considerations

Criteria used in the evaluation and decision-making process are to be made clear at the
time the candidate is hired. These standards and criteria include the College-wide principles
articulated in the bylaws for teaching, scholarship, and community service and the particular
standards and criteria articulated in the departmental and/or program SAC document.

Decisions on contract renewal, reappointment, tenure, and promotion should be based on
appropriate evidence carefully gathered in a manner consistent with maintaining the high
intellectual and professional aspirations of the faculty and a sense of common purpose.
Confidentiality shall be maintained at every stage of the process and concerning all matters of
substance involved in the review by all members of the faculty who have the responsibility of
reviewing a candidate. Confidentiality must be maintained even after a review has been
completed, except when the review is being appealed under the provisions of the bylaws. In that
case, individuals involved in the contract renewal or review must respond to any questions of the
Grievance Panel. The maintaining of confidentiality is a professional obligation to the members
of the community and breaking it endangers the integrity of the whole community.

Specific procedures for evaluation should be governed by the overriding principle of
providing a system for making informed, fair decisions which will at the same time protect
colleagues from excessive scrutiny, abusive or arbitrary treatment, or disruption of their teaching, while assisting their intellectual and professional growth.

4. Review III. For Promotion to Full Professor

a. Standards and criteria of the Colleges

For promotion to Full Professor, the area of scholarship is normally more definitive than the other areas, and emphasis will be placed on accomplishments subsequent to Review II. It is expected that teaching and community service will continue at the same or higher standard demonstrated at the time of Review II. Members of the faculty are normally considered for promotion to Full Professor in their sixth year as Associate Professor, having demonstrated significant scholarly accomplishment beyond that presented at the time of Review II. Associate professors who feel their case is not sufficiently strong may delay consideration. If promotion is not made following consideration in the sixth year, that faculty member should not normally be considered again for several years or until substantial new evidence is available.

Qualities to be considered in the area of teaching (not in rank order):
(a) Ability to inspire students to significant interest and accomplishment
(b) Enthusiasm in teaching
(c) Upholding high intellectual standards
(d) Encouragement of independent work
(e) Ability to instill critical habits of thought
(f) Innovativeness in course design, where appropriate
(g) Ability to convey central insights of the discipline
(h) Commitment to being "current" in his or her field
(i) Contributions to the general curriculum
(j) Fairness in assessing student performance
(k) Effectiveness in student advising

Qualities to be considered in the area of scholarly and professional work (not in rank order):
(a) The quality and originality of the work, including its advancement of knowledge, providing insights into problems, and offering new interpretations of continuing questions.
(b) The strength and quality of the candidate's intellectual engagement with others.
(c) Scholarly and professional reputation inside and outside the Colleges.
(d) Value as a resource to the department, the program, the general curriculum, and the intellectual community.

Qualities to be considered in the area of community service (not in rank order):
(a) Willingness to perform committee service and participate in campus decision-making.
(b) Special service to the community, such as planning symposia, arranging speakers, films, concerts, exhibitions.
(c) Planning faculty exchanges and arranging off-campus study opportunities.
(d) Participation in admissions and alumni/ae affairs and trustee relationships.

1. Roles and responsibilities in Review III

(a) Review III Committee

The main responsibility for this review lies with a departmental/program review committee, hereafter referred to as the Review III Committee. This body assembles the candidate’s file and prepares the report which is primarily evaluative, making a recommendation for or against promotion to Full Professor but also providing information to the candidate that will assist her/him in continuing to develop as a scholar, teacher, and colleague. Review III Committees can be constituted as either a committee of the whole, in which all voting members participate in all meetings, or as a sub-committee that meets on its own to discuss the case and prepare a report and recommendation, after which the sub-committee sends the report and recommendation to other departmental/program voting members, with whom it meets to discuss the report and take a final vote.

Those eligible to serve and to vote are all members of the department/program who have been employed in a tenure-track line or a line defined as ‘on-going part-time’ for at least one year. Spouses, partners, or relatives of candidates are not eligible to serve or to participate in any way in the review. Faculty on sabbatical or other leave may serve on the Review III Committee, but are not required to do so. Departmental/program members on phased retirement programs who have given up tenure are eligible to serve only if invited by the candidate, the department/program, and the Dean of Faculty and Provost.

The Review III Committee will consist of at least four persons and its composition must be approved by COTAP before the review commences. At least three persons will be members of the department/program who are eligible and able to serve (exceptions below), while one will be a tenured faculty member in a different division. This non-departmental/non-program faculty member is selected by the Review III Committee chair after consultation with the rest of the review committee, and is subject to approval by both the candidate and the chair of COTAP.

In departments/programs with fewer than three eligible faculty members able to serve, the Review III Committee shall consist of as many eligible faculty members as are able to serve, plus other eligible faculty members selected from the faculty as a whole by the available eligible departmental/program members and the candidate, subject to approval by COTAP and the Dean of Faculty and Provost. The Review III Committee will be constituted when four eligible faculty members have been selected in this way.

Each Review III Committee will have a sub-committee of three students, elected by majors and minors from among themselves, with representation of both Hobart and William Smith. (If this dual representation poses an undue burden, the department/program must receive an exemption from COTAP.) The role of this sub-committee will be to summarize student input on the candidate’s teaching in a short report to the Review III Committee. The students will present their findings to the
Committee, and these findings will be reflected in the Review III Committee report. The students’ signed report will become part of the candidate’s file.

When the Dean of Faculty and Provost in consultation with a department/program and COTAP agree that there is a well-founded basis, the Dean of Faculty and Provost may appoint a tenured member of the faculty to advise a department/program on procedure in conducting its faculty reviews. The consulting faculty member will attend all organizational and deliberative meetings, but will not read the files and will not be involved in substantive discussions.

(b) Departmental/Program Faculty

Because colleagues within the candidate’s department/program are likely to be most knowledgeable about the candidate’s strengths and weakness, especially in teaching and scholarly work, their role in Review III is to submit letters which, like the report, are primarily evaluative but also diagnostic. Letters should be based on the colleague’s own observations and experiences, not on the contents of the file as assembled at the time of the review. All departmental/program faculty will be invited to write a letter. The chair will ensure that at least two colleagues each visit at least one class session taught by the candidate before they write their letters. [Visits are encouraged for reviews in 2007-8, but not required.] Each colleague participating in the review will have the opportunity to comment on all materials in the file during the discussion of the case and the Review III Committee report.

If the faculty member undergoing Review III works with and has responsibilities in a program, but is chiefly connected to a department, program faculty are especially encouraged to write individual letters concerning the candidate. The program as a whole will prepare a recommendation only if it or the candidate specifically requests it. In these cases the program is not obligated to undertake a full review, but will have access to the candidate’s file and will meet to discuss and draft a recommendation based on evidence.

(c) The Candidate

The candidate’s responsibility is to provide to the Review III Committee the majority of the materials necessary for an informed evaluation of his/her teaching, scholarship, and community service. A central piece will be a statement that presents, explains, and assesses the candidate’s own record to date. The statement will include three sections:

(1) teaching: a discussion of teaching philosophy and teaching performance, aims and accomplishments, strengths and weaknesses;
(2) scholarship: description of the work pursued and accomplished since the candidate’s last review, plans for future work, and own location in the discipline;
(3) community service: a report on candidate’s college-wide, departmental and/or program activities, as well as activity in the larger community.

To support this statement, the candidate will also provide a curriculum vitae, copies of all course syllabi and selected course materials (such as exams, assignments, paper topics, other miscellaneous communication with students), and copies of all scholarship completed since Review II, as well as unpublished work she/he wishes to be considered.
The candidate and the Review III Committee chair jointly decide which work will be sent out for outside review. The candidate may also provide miscellaneous material that speaks to the candidate’s work, such as invitations to speak or present work in other classes or other schools. The candidate will be asked to provide the names of potential outside reviewers of his/her scholarship and the names of people who should be contacted for comments on the candidate’s teaching, scholarship, and/or community service.

(d) COTAP

COTAP’s role in Review III is to examine the candidate’s file, read the Review III Committee report, and prepare its own recommendation. COTAP will assess teaching, scholarship, and community service from the perspective of the Colleges as a whole, according to general Colleges’ standards, as well as to the standards expressed in the departmental/program SAC document. Any member of COTAP who is a member of the candidate’s department/program will recuse himself/herself from COTAP’s deliberations and discussions of the case. The COTAP member is eligible to serve on the candidate’s Review III Committee.

(e) The Dean of Faculty and Provost and the President

The Dean of Faculty and Provost may be involved in determining the composition of departmental/program review committees. The Associate Dean of Faculty, or other member of the Provost’s staff as designated by the Dean of Faculty and Provost, is responsible for determining when each candidate’s file is complete and ready to be read by the members of COTAP.

Having received the reports of COTAP and the Review III Committee, the Dean of Faculty and Provost makes a recommendation to the President. The President attends the meetings at which COTAP meets with the Dean of Faculty and Provost to discuss each Review III case. Having received the recommendation of the Dean of Faculty and Provost, the President makes his/her recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The President will write a letter to the candidate, to inform him/her of the outcome of Review III.

2. Specific Procedures
(a) Assembling the Candidate’s File

The candidate will provide his/her required materials to the Review III Committee between September 1 and October 1. The completed file is due in the Provost’s Office by the fourth Monday of January.

1. Outside Review of Scholarship

The candidate and the Review III Committee chair jointly decide which work the candidate will send out for outside review. The candidate is obliged to submit a representative sample (at least) of her/his scholarship for review by scholars in the discipline. Typically this will include both published and unpublished work. Work published in refereed publications should be considered by the Review III Committee as evidence of quality and originality, but at least some of it should still be sent out
for review to allow an outside scholar the chance to see the range of a candidate’s work. The Review III Committee report should describe the refereeing practice in each case.

Work will be sent to three to five outside reviewers, who are deemed able to speak from an informed position explicitly to the candidate’s accomplishments in and further potential for scholarly work. The candidate will submit a list of possible reviewers, specifying her/his relationship to each individual, and the Review III Committee will independently draw up a list of possible reviewers. The Committee’s list will be shown to the candidate, and the latter will specify her/his relationship to each individual, and can insist on the removal of one or more names on grounds that the individual is likely to be prejudiced against the candidate. In no circumstances should any reviewer be a former colleague, collaborator, or close friend of the candidate. Neither should a reviewer have a significant formal or informal connection to the Colleges. The Review III Committee report will explain how and why it chose the outside reviewers it did. Typically it is best to have a mix of outside reviewers: people of different levels (although all will usually be tenured), from different types of institutions, including people who work in a candidate’s specific subfield as well as those who simply work in the candidate’s discipline. At least two of the outside reviewers should not be personally acquainted with the candidate. If it is not practical to engage at least two such reviewers, the Review III Committee report will explain why. A curriculum vitae will be obtained from each reviewer. Interdisciplinary work should be sent to appropriate reviewers. The Review III Committee will treat the outside letters as constituting significant, but not all-determining, input on the candidate’s scholarship.

Since this is one of the few times a candidate is likely to hear a group of academic colleagues assessing her/his work, the Review III Committee report should accurately reflect the letters’ assessment of strengths and weaknesses of that work. Representative quotations from the letters should be included in the Review III Committee report. At the Committee’s discretion, an appendix can be included with more extensive quotations so as to provide the candidate with more specific comments, suggestions, praises, or criticisms that the Committee deems will be beneficial for the candidate, provided the quotations do not give away the reviewer’s identity.

2. Assessing student perceptions of the candidate

The Review III Committee will solicit comments from students who have taken a course with the candidate since the candidate’s last review, using a letter [the Committee develops] developed by COTAP. This letter will be sent to all currently matriculated students and to alumni/ae who have taken one or more courses with the candidate. All comments from students must be signed. The report will include the number of students contacted and the percentage responding, as well as copies of the materials sent out to students and a record of the date(s) they were sent.

A summary of student course evaluation forms will be completed for each course taught since the last review either by the student sub-committee or by faculty members of the Review III Committee. For each course section, the number of evaluations in the file, the number of students in the course, and the percent of
students completing evaluations will be indicated. For each course taught, there must be a systematic summary and assessment of the student evaluations. The department- or program-specific summary may be in prose or in a numerical format. The summary of College-wide questions will be in numerical format. The methods and procedures used in preparing these summaries should be explained in the Review III Committee report.

The student report will reflect student opinion on the candidate’s teaching. Specifically, the report will comment on the student course evaluation forms and student responses to the solicitation letter.

3. Soliciting comments from colleagues

Using the list supplied by the candidate, the Review III Committee will contact faculty and staff from the Colleges and individuals from outside of the Colleges with whom the candidate has worked, requesting signed letters that comment on the candidate in relation to the standards for Review III. In addition, the Committee will receive signed letters written in response to a general solicitation sent out to all faculty and administrators [by the Committee] by COTAP, asking for letters that comment on each of the candidates undergoing Review III in a given year. The file will include a copy of all solicitation letters that were sent out.

(b) Writing the Review III Committee Report

The Review III Committee will prepare a report that (1) describes the procedures used during the review; (2) summarizes and evaluates the materials in the file; and (3) makes a recommendation based on its evaluation of the materials in the file. Its central goal is to assess the candidate’s teaching, scholarly accomplishments and potential, and community service. The report will summarize the file’s evidence concerning the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses, suggest areas for improvement and offer recommendations for improvement, and represent the tenor of the committee’s discussions. The report will evaluate the candidate on the basis of the relevant SAC document. Differing assessments of the evidence should be made clear in the report. In the end, the report makes a recommendation on whether the candidate should or should not pass Review III and be promoted to Full Professor and is signed by all members of the Review III Committee who agree with the recommendation. Any dissenting opinions, together with reasons, must be spelled out in a separate written and signed statement.

The Review III Committee report, along with any statement of dissenting opinion, is given to the candidate. In the case of non-unanimous reports, the candidate does not receive a list of who voted which way. The candidate will submit to the chair of the Committee, a letter addressed to COTAP, stating that she/he has read the report and any statement written by dissenters, along with any comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications the candidate would like to make. This letter is required before the file is submitted to COTAP.

(c) The Completed File

The completed file will consist of the following materials, which will be the evidentiary basis of Review III:

(1) Table of contents.
(2) Copy of Colleges-wide standards for Review III and relevant SAC document.
(3) Candidate’s curriculum vitae.
(4) Candidate’s Review II reports (Review II Committee and COTAP) plus any previous Review III reports.
(5) Written statement by candidate concerning her/his scholarly work, achievements, and aims; teaching philosophy and assessment of own teaching performance; and record of community service.
(6) Record of courses taught and enrollments, including Honors projects, independent studies, and MAT theses, since Review II (supplied by Registrar’s office).
(7) Copies of all course syllabi and other selected teaching materials for the time period covered by Review III.
(8) Student course evaluations for all courses taught since Review II, with summaries of the departmental/program and Colleges-wide questions for each course.
(9) Responses of all current and former students to a solicitation letter, seeking comments on the candidate. Responses must be signed.
(10) Scholarship: this includes any published and unpublished writing, paintings, compositions, slides, book reviews, and other forms of professional engagement which the candidate wishes to be considered. Candidate should include all such work produced since Review II.
(11) Miscellaneous material related to professional engagement and community service, such as reviews and citations of candidate’s work, records of participation in professional organizations and professional affairs.
(12) Signed letters from departmental and/or program colleagues.
(13) Signed letters from non-departmental/program colleagues at the Colleges, commenting on the teaching, scholarship, and community service of the candidate.
(14) Signed letters from people outside of the Colleges with whom the candidate has worked. A copy of the letter sent out will also be included.
(15) Letters from outside reviewers of scholarly work. Letters must be signed or received by COTAP-approved electronic means. Also included will be a curriculum vitae from each outside reviewer, a list of the materials sent out to reviewers, and a copy of the letter sent with these materials.
(16) Report of the student sub-committee.
(17) Review III Committee report. Also, a letter of any dissenting opinions, together with reasons.
(18) Late-arriving materials.
(19) Signed letter from candidate certifying that she/he has read the Review III Committee report (and, if present, statement written by any dissenters), along with candidate’s comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications.
(20) Signed letters from members of COTAP, describing their relationship to the candidate.
(21) COTAP report.
(22) Signed letter from Candidate, addressed to the Dean of Faculty and Provost, certifying that she/he has read the COTAP report, along with candidate’s comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications.
(d) Review of the file by COTAP

The entire file is submitted to the Dean of Faculty and Provost’s Office, and the Associate Dean of Faculty, or other member of the Provost’s staff as designated by the Dean of Faculty and Provost, will check to see that all required materials (except for the last three items) are included. If the Associate Dean of Faculty determines that something is missing, she/he will ask the Review III Committee to remedy the problem. The file will be sent to COTAP when it is complete.

COTAP members will read the complete file, and then discuss the case as a group. In the course of its deliberations, it may convene a meeting with the Review III Committee for the purpose of better understanding its recommendation. It may also meet separately with the signers of any dissenting statement. Following its deliberations, COTAP will write a signed report explaining its recommendation. In cases where COTAP comes to a recommendation different from that in Review III Committee report, its report must make clear why it disagrees. This report is sent to the candidate, the chair of the Review III Committee, and the Dean of Faculty and Provost. The candidate will confirm, in a letter addressed to the Dean of Faculty and Provost, with copies to COTAP and the chair of the Review III Committee, that she/he has read COTAP’s statement. The candidate may make comments, corrections, rebuttals, or amplifications in this letter. Once the candidate has sent this letter, COTAP will meet with the Dean of Faculty and Provost and the President to discuss the case.

(e) Final decision regarding Review III

Following the meeting of COTAP with the President and the Dean of Faculty and Provost, the Dean of Faculty and Provost makes his/her own recommendation to the President. Prior to making this recommendation, the Dean of Faculty and Provost may meet with the Review III Committee or COTAP if she/he thinks it necessary. The President, having received the recommendation of the Dean of Faculty and Provost, may meet with COTAP or the Review III Committee prior to making his/her recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The President will write a letter to the candidate, with copies to the Dean of Faculty and Provost and the Review III Committee chair, to inform the candidate of the outcome of Review III. Following a negative decision, the candidate may request from the Dean of Faculty and Provost a written explanation of that decision.